

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 are currently pending, Claims 1, 11, and 18 having been amended by the present amendment. Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 11, and 18 is found in Fig. 4, for example, and therefore no new matter is added. Support for new Claim 26 is found in the Specification, at page 1, lines 10-12, for example, and therefore no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-8, 11-16, and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Whitmire et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,403, hereinafter Whitmire); and Claims 9, 10, 17, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Whitmire in view of Compliment et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,360,260).

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the personal interview between the Examiner, her Supervisor, and Applicants' representatives on March 31, 2005. During the interview, the proposed claim amendments were discussed and the Examiners agreed that the proposed claim amendments overcome the current rejection based on art. The claims presented in this Amendment are the proposed claim amendments discussed during the interview. Arguments presented during the interview are reiterated below.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of issuing custom traps for a network containing disparate network devices. The method includes: presenting a series of objects in a graphic user interface for receiving user input for different stages in defining a custom trap, the objects allowing a selection of device attributes and thresholds to be included in definitions of the custom trap; storing the custom trap in a network manager, wherein the custom trap includes a triggering condition for a selected device among the network devices; monitoring the selected device to detect whether the triggering condition has been met; and in response to detecting that the triggering condition has been met, automatically issuing the custom trap.

This configuration of steps allows network administrators to supplement or replace vendor-defined traps in network devices.¹

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Whitmire, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Whitmire does not teach or suggest the claimed “...customizing a trap for use as a custom trap, said step of customizing including selecting device attributes and thresholds using a graphic user interface....”

Whitmire describes a network device with selectable traps. Table 4 lists traps that are supported by a management agent 1302, which is a part of the management system. The management system is programmable to select the traps of any particular non-standard or standard database.² The management agent then issues traps according to the selected trap definition.³ Whitmire does not describe or suggest using a graphic user interface.

Whitmire only describes selecting traps from a list in a database and does not describe or suggest defining custom traps. The selected traps described in Whitmire are not “custom traps” because Whitmire does not describe or suggest “selecting device attributes and thresholds.”

Furthermore, as Whitmire does not teach or suggest custom traps, Whitmire cannot teach or suggest “storing the custom trap” and “issuing the custom trap.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Compliment does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Whitmire. Compliment describes registering an SNMP device and does not describe or suggest “custom traps.”

In view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 (and dependent Claims 2-10) patentably distinguish over Whitmire and Compliment,

¹ Specification, page 5, lines 26-28.

² Whitmire, col. 29, lines 59-61.

³ Whitmire, col. 3, lines 48-50.

alone or in combination. Applicants also submit that independent Claims 11 and 18 (and dependent Claims 12-17 and 19-26) patentably distinguish over Whitmire and Compliment, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given for Claim 1.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Michael E. Monaco
Registration No. 52,041

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\JW\263552US\263552US_AM.DOC